

**OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS
RENDERED BY THE INTER-
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the Commission

VOLUME 5. Part 3. Pp.23—44

OPINION 242

Designation, under the Plenary Powers, of a type species for *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces) in harmony with accustomed nomenclatorial usage (correction of an error in *Opinion 92*)



LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office

41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

1954

Price Eight Shillings and Threepence

(All rights reserved)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION AT THE TIME OF THE ADOPTION OF THE RULING GIVEN IN OPINION 242

A. The Officers of the Commission

President : Dr. Karl Jordan, Ph.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts, England*).

Vice-President : Dr. James L. Peters (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*).

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*London, England*).

B. The Members of the Commission

Class 1949

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (*La Plata, Argentina*).

Mr. Francis HEMMING (*London, England*) (*Secretary to the Commission*).

Dr. Karl JORDAN (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts, England*) (*President of the Commission*).

Dr. Th. MORTENSEN (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*).

Dr. Joseph PEARSON (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*).

Class 1952

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (*S. Paulo, Brazil*).

Professor J. Chester BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*).

Professor Lodovico di CAPORIACCO (*University of Parma, Italy*).

Professor J. R. DYMOND (*University of Toronto, Canada*).

Dr. James L. PETERS (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) (*Vice-President of the Commission*).

Dr. Harold E. VOKES (*United States Geological Survey, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*).

Class 1955

Professor Dr. Hilbrand BOSCHMA (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*).

Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (*Tayport, Fife, Scotland*).

Professor Teiso ESAKI (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*).

Professor Béla HANKÓ (*University of Debrecen, Hungary*).

Dr. Tadeusz JACZEWSKI (*Polish Zoological Museum, Warsaw, Poland*).

Dr. Norman R. STOLL (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.*).

C. Alternate Members of the Commission at the Session held in Paris in 1948

Professor Enrique BELTRÁN (*Instituto Mexicano de Recursos Naturales Renovables A.C., Mexico City, Mexico*).

Dr. Edward HINDLE (*Zoological Society of London, London, England*).

Dr. Arturo Ricardo JORGE (*Museu Bocage, Lisbon, Portugal*).

Professor Harold KIRBY (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*).

Dr. Henning LEMCHE (*Kgl. Veterinær- og Landbohøjskole, Zoologisk Laboratorium, Copenhagen, Denmark*).

Professor Kamel MANSOUR (*King Fouad University, Cairo, Egypt*).

Professor Z. P. METCALF (*North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, University of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina, U.S.A.*).

Mr. N. D. RILEY (*British Museum (Natural History), London, England*).

Professor Ragnar SPÄRCK (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*).

Professor Victor van STRAELEN (*Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique, Bruxelles, Belgium*).

Professor Robert L. USINGER (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*).

OPINION 242

DESIGNATION, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, OF A TYPE SPECIES FOR "ECHENEIS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS PISCES) IN HARMONY WITH ACCUSTOMED NOMENCLATORIAL USAGE (CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN "OPINION" 92)

RULING :—(1) Under the Plenary Powers the original indication, by Linnaean tautonymy (as prescribed by *Opinion* 16), of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby set aside and *Echeneis neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby designated as the type species of the foregoing genus.

(2) Neither Gouan (1770) nor Forster (1771), when using the word "Remora", used it as a generic name, and accordingly the reputed generic names *Remora* Gouan, 1770, and *Remora* Forster, 1771, are to be rejected as possessing no status in zoological nomenclature.

(3) The decision given implicitly in *Opinion* 92 (when the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, was placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*) that the spelling of the specific name *neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Echeneis neucrates*, was incorrect and should be emended to "*naucrates*" is hereby expressly confirmed.

(4) The position on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby confirmed, subject to the insertion of a note that *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, is the type species of this genus by designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) above (decision confirming action taken in *Opinion* 92).

(5) The generic name *Remora* (gender of name : feminine) Gill, 1862 (type species, by absolute tautonymy : *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758) is hereby placed on the

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology as Name No. 668.

(6) The under-mentioned reputed but non-existent generic names, rejected under (2) above, are hereby placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* as Names Nos. 62 and 63 :—(a) *Remora* Gouan, 1770 ; (b) *Remora* Forster, 1771.

(7) The under-mentioned specific names are hereby placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* as Names Nos. 60 and 61 :—(a) *naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Echeneis naucrates* ; (b) *remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Echeneis remora*.

(8) The specific name *neucrates* (an Invalid Original Spelling for *naucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Echeneis neucrates*, is hereby placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* as Name No. 17.

I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

When in 1943 Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission, was engaged in an examination of the older of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission for the purpose of extracting therefrom the particulars which would be needed for inclusion in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* when published in book form, he found that the entry on that *List* in respect of the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, made in *Opinion* 92 (1926, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 4) : 3—4) was incorrect. For in that *Opinion* it was stated that the type species of this genus was *Echeneis naucrates* [emend. of *neucrates*] Linnaeus, 1758, notwithstanding the fact that as far back as 1910 the Commission had itself pointed out in *Opinion* 16 (*Smithson. Publ.* 1938 : 34) that under the doctrine of Linnaean tautonymy propounded in that *Opinion* the type species of the

genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, was *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758. On the discovery of the foregoing mistake in *Opinion* 92, it became evident that it would be necessary for the International Commission either (1) to use its Plenary Powers to validate the entry on the *Official List* of *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus as the type species or (2) to correct the entry on the *List* relating to this generic name by substituting the name of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus for that of *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus as the name of the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus. As the relative merits of these two courses was a matter for specialists in the group to advise upon, Mr. Hemming in 1944 sought advice on the question from a number of ichthyologists. Replies were received from :—(a) Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) ; (b) Dr. C. M. Breder, Jr. (*American Museum of Natural History, Department of Fishes, New York, N. Y., U.S.A.*) ; (c) Dr. Leonard P. Schultz (*United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) and Dr. Samuel F. Hildebrand and Dr. Robert R. Miller of the same Institution. All the foregoing specialists were opposed to the acceptance of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus and, therefore, favoured the use of the Plenary Powers in this case. In view of the unanimous advice so received, Mr. Hemming decided in 1945 to prepare an application, for submission to the International Commission, drawing attention to the error committed in *Opinion* 92, setting out the advice received from specialists and submitting a recommendation that the Commission should use its Plenary Powers to validate the erroneous entry regarding the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus made in the *Official List* in the foregoing *Opinion*. The application so submitted by Mr. Hemming was as follows :—

On an error, due to the non-observance of the provisions of “ Opinion ” 16, contained in the portion of “ Opinion ” 92, in which the name “ Echeneis ” Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces), was placed on the “ Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ”, and on the remedial action proposed

By FRANCIS HEMMING

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In *Opinion* 16, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature laid it down that, where an author, in publishing a

new generic name,* cites in the synonymy of one of the included species a name published prior to 1758 which is clearly a uninomial (i.e. univocal) specific name and which consists of the same word as the new generic name, the species for which such pre-1758 name is cited as a synonym is to be treated as being automatically the type species of the new genus by absolute tautonymy under the provisions of rule (d) in Article 30† of the *Règles Internationales*.

2. In paragraph 2 of *Opinion* 16, the International Commission gave a list of 63 generic names, the type species of each of which appeared to have been fixed in the manner described above at the time when the names in question were severally published. One of the names included in the list given in paragraph 2 of *Opinion* 16 was *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 260.

3. When the genus *Echeneis* was established in 1758, Linnaeus placed in it two species only, namely : (1) *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 260 ; and (2) *Echeneis naucrates* (emendation of *neucrates*‡) Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* 1 : 261.

4. Linnaeus made four entries in the synonymy of the species *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, the third of which was : “*Gron. mus.* 1. n. 33. *Echeneis.*” In this way Linnaeus signified that the species to which he applied the name *Echeneis remora* was the same species as that to which in 1754 Laurentius Theodorus Gronovius had referred under the name “*Echeneis*” in the first volume of his *Museum Ichthyologicum*. In these circumstances, the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, is fixed automatically by *Opinion* 16, as *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, since all the conditions laid down in that *Opinion* for the citation in synonymy of a tautonymous pre-1758 uninomial specific name are satisfied in this case. The position is, therefore, that *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, is the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy under rule (d) in Article 30, as interpreted by *Opinion* 16.

* A limitation was imposed upon *Opinion* 16 by the amendment to Article 25 of the *Règles Internationales* adopted by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at Budapest in 1927. In consequence, the provisions of *Opinion* 16 now apply only to names published on, or before, 31st December 1930, the last day prior to the coming into operation of the Budapest amendment to Article 25.

† It should be recalled that the rules in Article 30 operate only in succession to one another. Accordingly, rule (d) is only operative, where the type of a genus has not already been fixed either under rule (a) or under rule (b) or under rule (c). Thus, *Opinion* 16 has no bearing upon the type species of genera, where those type species have been designated or indicated under rules (a), (b) or (c) of Article 30.

‡ The specific name of this species was printed as “*neucrates*” in 1758 in the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus. The spelling of this name has been emended to “*naucrates*” by subsequent authors.

5. In August 1924 Dr. C. W. Stiles, Secretary to the International Commission, issued a circular letter (C.L. 86) to all members of the Commission, in which, after referring to the proposals for the addition of a large number of names to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* submitted by Commissioner Karl Apstein in 1915,* he gave particulars of the names of certain genera belonging to the Classes Amphibia, Reptilia, and Pisces, which had been included in the Apstein List and recently been re-studied by various specialists, who had reported that the names in question were valid,† that the type species had been correctly fixed in accordance with the provisions of the *Règles Internationales* and, therefore, that these names could properly be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, without the use by the International Commission of their Plenary Powers. The specialist by whom the names of genera belonging to the Class Pisces included in Dr. Stiles's list were stated to have been restudied was Dr. David Starr Jordan, who was himself at that time a member of the International Commission. Dr. Stiles added that, in view of the favourable reports received from the specialists consulted, he recommended that the generic names in question should be added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with the type species indicated in his Circular Letter. In due course, nine members of the International Commission signified their concurrence in Dr. Stiles's proposals, which were thereupon adopted (by 10 votes to nil, with 7 abstentions) as *Opinion 92* of the International Commission. This *Opinion* was published in October 1926.‡

6. One of the names placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* by *Opinion 92* was *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758. The entry relating to this generic name in *Opinion 92* reads as follows: “*Echeneis* Linn., 1758a, 260, type *E. naucrates* Linn. 1758a, 261”.

7. No particulars were given in *Opinion 92* regarding the manner in which the type species of the genera there enumerated had been determined (i.e. whether by original designation, monotypy, absolute tautonymy, or subsequent selection). In the case of the names of genera belonging to the Class Pisces, there is, however, the following note in the circular letter referred to in paragraph 5 above: “For data by Dr. Jordan see THE GENERA OF FISHES, Jordan and Evermann,

* The list submitted by Commissioner Karl Apstein formed the subject of discussion in the Commission's *Opinion 74* (published in 1922 in *Smithson. misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 1) : 32—34), the “summary” of which reads as follows:—“The Commission has no power to adopt *en bloc* Apstein's list of proposed *Nomina Conservanda*, but is prepared to consider names separately upon presentation of reasonably complete evidence.”

† The use of the expression “valid” in this connection is incorrect. A name is either “available” or “unavailable” under the *Règles Internationales*. The question whether an “available name” is also a “valid name” is a taxonomic, and not a nomenclatorial, question.

‡ *Opinion 92* was published in 1926, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 4) : 3—4.

1917a". Reference to the above work (Jordan & Evermann, 1917, *Genera Fishes* (1) : 12) shows that the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus was there dealt with as follows :—

Echeneis Linnaeus, 260, after Artedi ; type ECHENEIS NAUCRATES L. (misprinted NEUCRATES).

First restriction by Gill, *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila.*, 1862, 239. In 1864, *loc. cit.* 60, Gill proposed to adopt as type ECHENEIS REMORA, this being the only species noted by Artedi, and in Linnaeus's earlier writings. But as Linnaeus referred both species to ECHENEIS, this change seems not warranted.

8. The points which it is important to note are the following :—

(i) In 1917, Jordan and Evermann :—

- (a) gave no consideration to the question of the applicability of *Opinion* 16 to the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, notwithstanding the fact that in *Opinion* 16 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had indicated that there were *prima facie* grounds for considering that *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of that genus by absolute tautonymy ;
- (b) disregarded the action of Gill (1864) in selecting *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 ; and
- (c) adopted *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758.

(ii) When in the period 1924—1926 the question of placing the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, upon the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* was under consideration, the conclusions reached by Jordan and Evermann in 1917 were not re-examined by the International Commission. In consequence, no consideration was given to the question whether the provisions of *Opinion* 16 applied to the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, and, therefore, whether under the *Règles Internationales* the type species of this genus was *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, and not *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as concluded by Jordan and Evermann in 1917.

9. It is most unfortunate that the question of the applicability of *Opinion* 16 to *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, was not considered by the International Commission at the time when *Opinion* 92 was in preparation, since the failure to do so has had the result that in that *Opinion* the International Commission, when placing the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, erroneously stated that the type species of that genus was *Echeneis*

naucrates Linnaeus, 1758, whereas, in fact (as shown in paragraph 4 above), *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, is the type species of that genus by absolute tautonymy under rule (d) in Article 30 as interpreted by *Opinion* 16.

10. The decisions embodied in *Opinion* 92 were not taken by the International Commission under their Plenary Powers, and in consequence nothing in that *Opinion* can have the effect of inserting in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* an entry which is contrary to the provisions of the *Règles Internationales*. Accordingly, the portion of *Opinion* 92 which states that *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, is the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, is *ultra vires* and therefore invalid.

11. It is clearly essential that, when, as on the present occasion, an error on a question of fact is detected in an *Opinion* rendered by the International Commission, the earliest possible opportunity should be taken to rectify the error so detected. In the present case there are two courses of action, either of which it is open to the International Commission to take, namely :—

(1) to render an *Opinion* cancelling the entry in *Opinion* 92 relating to the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, and substituting therefore an amended entry placing that name on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species by absolute tautonymy under rule (d) in Article 30 of the *Règles Internationales*, as interpreted by *Opinion* 16 ;

OR

(2) to render an *Opinion* under the Commission's Plenary Powers (a) cancelling the designation of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, and (b) specifying *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of that genus.

12. Course (1) above is clearly the proper course to adopt, unless it can be shown that the strict application of the *Règles Internationales* in the case of the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, will clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity, in which event Course (2) would be the proper course to follow. Only specialists in the Class Pisces are in a position to furnish the International Commission with the material necessary to enable them to form a conclusion on the question whether confusion rather than uniformity would clearly result from the strict application of the *Règles* in this case through the acceptance of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, and therefore whether or not the *Règles* should be suspended in this case in order to validate existing practice by specifying *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species of this genus.

13. It was in 1944 that I first discovered the mistake in *Opinion* 92 in regard to the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, while I was engaged in an examination of the subsequent history of the numerous generic names, of which the status is discussed in *Opinion* 16 but on which no decision was taken in that *Opinion*. On making this discovery, I thought it well to obtain preliminary advice from leading ichthyologists on the question whether this was a case in which the *Règles* should be allowed to take their course and existing practice should be set aside through the recognition of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, or whether, in the view of the specialists consulted, the prospect of confusion arising from the adoption of that course was such as to justify the use by the International Commission of their Plenary Powers for the purpose of designating *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758. In putting the case before the specialists concerned, I drew attention also to the fact that, according to the latest Nomenclator (Neave, 1940, *Nomencl. zool.* 4 : 21), the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, *Proc. Acad. nat. sci. Philad.* 1862 : 239 (the name of the genus to which the species *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, is commonly referred) is a homonym (1) of *Remora* Gouan, 1770, *Hist. Pisc.* 10, 183, and (2) of *Remora* Forster, 1771, *Cat. Anim. N. Amer.* : 20. I accordingly asked the specialists concerned, when replying to the main question which I had put to them, to indicate also their views on the question whether the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, was an available name or whether it was, as then appeared probable, an invalid homonym under Article 34 of the *Règles Internationales*.

14. The following are the replies received from the specialists consulted :—

(a) Views of Dr. Ethelwynn Trewavas, Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History), London

(letter dated 24th October 1944)

Unfortunately, the library being evacuated, I cannot go into the *Echeneis*—*Remora* question as I should. But I think it is right to say that the use now of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, would cause confusion.

Remora Gill, 1862,* is not a homonym, as, according to the writers whom I have consulted, the first two authors listed by

* The volume of the *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* in which the name *Remora* Gill was published has no volume number. It is the volume for the year 1862 and should therefore be cited as *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* 1862. It was published in Parts, like similar journals, and the dates of publication of the several Parts are given at the foot of the page on each signature. The signature in which the name *Remora* Gill appears is dated "April 1862". The title page of the volume was published after the close of 1862 and is dated "1863". This is no doubt the reason why the name *Remora* Gill is inadvertently treated in the latest Nomenclator (Neave 1940, *Nomencl. zool.* 4 : 21) as having been published in 1863.

Neave in his *Nomenclator zoologicus* (Gouan, 1770, and Forster, 1771) used it in the same sense as have later authors, i.e. with *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus as type by absolute tautonymy. If it is possible, I hope that a decision may be postponed until the library is available again, as I have not been able to consult either Gouan or Forster.

(b) Views of Dr. C. M. Breder, Jr., Department of Fishes, American Museum of Natural History, New York

(letter dated 29th November 1944)

I have studied your statement concerning the status of the type of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758. In cases of this sort which involve the inversion of established generic names I believe that true "confusion" as opposed to mere "inconvenience" is the inevitable resultant effect. Consequently I recommend that the appropriate action be taken to firmly establish *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of *Echeneis* Linnaeus.

Due to the press of other matters I have not been able to look up Gill, 1862, but I do not believe that any treatment of his would change my view concerning the inadvisability of permitting *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, to become properly established as the type of *Echeneis*.

(c) Views of Dr. Leonard P. Schultz, Dr. Samuel F. Hildebrand and Dr. Robert R. Miller, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.

(letter from Dr. Leonard P. Schultz dated 1st December 1944)

Your letter of November 16th concerning the genera *Echeneis* and *Remora* arrived on the 29th, and, after considerable investigation, I have come to certain conclusions which are explained below.

Echeneis Linnaeus, 1758, has two species listed in the following order: (1) *E. remora*, and (2) *E. naucrates*. After, 1758, *E. remora* was listed by very numerous authors and the vernacular name—*Remora*—was used many times both for *E. remora* and *E. naucrates* and, no doubt, for other species of this group of fishes.

The next question is when was the genus *Remora* established and the genus *Echeneis* first restricted?

Neave (*Nomenclator Zoologicus*, vol. 4, p. 21, 1940) cites *Remora* Gouan, 1770 (*Hist. Pisc.*, p. 10, [107], 183) but, in looking this up, I find that the left-hand page 183 is in Latin and the generic name *Echeneis* is used, whereas the right-hand page (also numbered 183) is the French translation of the opposite page 183 and the name used is "Le Remora". No species is cited anywhere. Thus, in my opinion, "*Remora*" was not used generically in 1770.

Forster, 1771, *A Catalogue of the Animals of North America* . . . (reprint of 1882 examined by me) has three columns throughout. The column on the left-hand side of each page gives a common name preceded by a Roman number and on page 6 this series of numbers has over it the name "Genus". The second column also contains common or vernacular names, breaking down further the common name in the left-hand column. The third column usually (but not always) contains a Latin binomial name, as for example :—

XIV	Cod	**	Jugular
		Common	ib.
		Frost	<i>Gadus callarias</i> Mus. Bl.
		Tau	<i>Gadus</i> Tau
XVIII.	Remora	***	Thoracic
		Remora	<i>Ech. neucrates</i> C.II.26

Thus, I conclude that *Remora* is not used in the binomial sense but only as a common name by Forster, 1771 and 1882.

I have searched the literature and can find no generic use of *Remora* previous to that of Gill (April 1862, *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, p. 239). Gill revised the "family of Echeneidoidae",

* (a) Gill's action here described fulfils all the conditions laid down in *Opinion* 6. Accordingly, if no type species had previously been designated, indicated or selected for the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, Gill's action on this occasion would constitute a valid selection *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, as the type of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus.

(b) Although the name *Remora* was published by Gill in 1862 without a description or definition, it is a nomenclatorially available name, since the genus is monotypical and the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, was, therefore, published with an "indication" (as defined by *Opinion* 1) and accordingly satisfies the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles Internationales*.

† As Gill designated *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Remora* Gill, 1862, that species is automatically the type species of that genus under rule (a) in Article 30 of the *Règles Internationales*. The specific

giving a key to the various genera, some new, citing the genotype for each, as, for example, in my reprint of his article :—

*Echeneis** (*E. naucrates* L.)

Remora† (*E. remora* L.)

Thus Gill 1862, not only established the genus *Remora*, but also restricted the genus *Echeneis* L. to the species *E. naucrates* L. Further, he was the first reviser and, in addition, his genus *Remora* has but a single species cited,* that is, *E. remora* L., which is tautotypic for *Remora*.

The next binomial use of *Remora* appears to be that of Bleeker (September 1863, *Onzième Notice sur la Faune Ichthyologique de l'Ile de Ternate*). On page 9 of my reprint the name is used as “279. *Remora albescens* Gill=*Echeneis albescens* Schl.”

Gill (March 1864,‡ *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, pp. 59—60) reversed himself in regard to the genotypes of both *Echeneis* and *Remora* when he published the following :—

Elevating these types with others to independent generic rank, I have restricted *Echeneis* to the genus typified by *E. naucrates* and called that one typified by *E. remora*, *Remora*, which name Dr. Bleeker has since accepted. On examining the works of Linnaeus and Artedi, I find, however, that *E. remora* was the only species referred to that genus by Linnaeus in the earlier editions of the *Systema Naturae*, and by Artedi ; and that in the later editions, Linnaeus placed that species at the head of the genus. The *E. remora* must consequently be regarded as the type of the genus, and a new name (*Leptecheneis*) conferred on *E. naucrates*. The genera of Echeneidoideae will then be known by the following names :

name (*remora*) is the same word as that which constitutes the name of the genus (*Remora*), and this fact would make that species the type species of *Remora* Gill by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) of Article 30, if the type species of that genus had not previously been fixed in some other manner. In this connection, it must be recalled that the Rules set out in Article 30 are not Rules which operate independently of one another but on the contrary are Rules which operate only in succession to one another in a diminishing order of priority. Accordingly, in the present case, the type species of the genus *Remora* Gill, 1862, is *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, through the operation of Rule (a) in Article 30 (type by original designation). In these circumstances, the later Rule (d) in the same Article has no applicability to the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862.

‡ This volume of the *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* was issued without a volume number and with the dates of publication of the several Parts printed at the foot of each signature in the same way as the volume for 1862.

REMORAE

Echeneis remora L.

1. *Echeneis* L., *Art.* Type, *Echeneis remora* L.*
2. *Remoropsis* Gill. Type, *Echeneis brachyptera* Lowe.
3. *Rhombochirus* Gill. Type, *Echeneis osteochir* Cuv.
4. *Remilegia* Gill. Type, *Echeneis australis* Bennett=*Echeneis scutata* Günther.

LEPTECHENEIDES

5. *Leptecheneis* Gill. Type, *Echeneis neucrates* L.
6. *Phtheirichthys* Gill. Type, *Echeneis lineatus* Menzies.

The current use of the two genera is almost universal among present-day ichthyologists, most of whom have completely ignored *Opinion* 16 and have followed Gill and *Opinion* 92. Listed below are a few works of importance that recognise both genera (*Echeneis* and *Remora*) with the genotypes as given :

Jordan, Evermann, and Clark, Check List of Fishes—North America—, Rept. U.S. Comm. Fish., 1928, Pt. 2, p. 448, 1930 (*Echeneis* L., type *E. naucrates* L.); (*Remora* Forster, type *E. remora* L.)

Meek and Hildebrand, Marine Fishes of Panama, vol. 3, p. 896, 1928 (*Echeneis* L., type *E. Naucrates* L.); (*Remora* Forster, type *E. remora* L.)

Fowler, Marine Fishes of West Africa, vol. 2, pp. 1018, 1021, 1936 (*Remora* Forster, type *E. remora* L.); (*Echeneis* L. type *E. neucrates* L.)

Schultz, *U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull.* 180, pp. 259, 260, 1943 (*Echeneis* L., type *E. naucrates* L.); (*Remora* Forster, type *E. remora* L.)

* Gill's action in 1862 would have constituted a valid selection of *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, if it had not been for the fact that *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, had been the type species of that genus from the date of its original publication (1758) by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) in Article 30 as interpreted by *Opinion* 16. In no circumstances, therefore, could Gill's action in 1864 in selecting *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus have had any power to reverse or set aside the selection by the same author in 1862 of *Echeneis naucrates* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus. For the reasons explained above, Gill's action in 1862 was invalid, because through the operation of Rule (d) in Article 30 and *Opinion* 16 the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus had always been *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus. By a pure accident, therefore, the statement by Gill in 1864 that *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus is the type species of this genus happens to correspond correctly with the actual position under the *Règles Internationales* but this is not due in any way to the action then taken by Gill.

L. S. Berg (Classification of Fishes both Recent and Fossil, *Travaux Inst. Zool. Acad. Sci. URSS*, vol. 5, Pt. 2, p. 495, 1940) recognised both genera, *Echeneis* and *Remora*.

My conclusions are that both genera should be recognised and that *Remora* dates from Gill 1862, and not from Forster 1771, or Gouan 1770. It is clear that the genotypes are those named by Gill 1862, who, as stated heretofore, was the first reviser and the first to restrict the genus *Echeneis* L. To change the genotypes from those designated by Gill, 1862, would result in actual confusion. They should stand as currently used by ichthyologists—*Remora* Gill, 1862 (type *E. remora* L.) and *Echeneis* L. (type *E. neucrates* L.).

Dr. Samuel F. Hildebrand and Dr. Robert R. Miller, both actively engaged in systematic ichthyology here at the United States National Museum, concur in the opinions stated above.

15. In view of the unanimous nature of the advice received from the specialists consulted, a clear *prima facie* case has been established in support of the view that the strict application of the *Règles* in the case of the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (i.e. the acceptance of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy under Rule (d) in Article 30 of the *Règles Internationales*, as interpreted by *Opinion* 16) would clearly result in greater confusion than uniformity. It follows, therefore, that the course best calculated to promote stability in the nomenclature of the Order Discocephali in the Class Pisces would be for the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use their Plenary Powers in order to validate the (at present) erroneous entry in *Opinion* 92 in regard to the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, thereby validating also the current practice of specialists in the group concerned. For this purpose, it would be necessary for the International Commission (i) to set aside the designation of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy and (ii) to designate *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus.

16. Further, I agree with the view expressed by Drs. Schultz, Hildebrand and Miller that, if the foregoing action is to be taken in regard to the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, it is desirable that at the same time action should be taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to dispose of the outstanding points in regard to the name *Remora*. In view of the evidence brought forward, it seems to me that the most satisfactory course would be for the International Commission to suppress under their Plenary Powers all uses of the name *Remora* as a generic name prior to the publication of the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* 1862 : 239. The name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (type species by original

designation ; *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 260) could then be added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

17. The proposal which will, therefore, be submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is that they should render an *Opinion* under their Plenary Powers in the following terms:—

- (a) Under suspension of the *Règles*, it is hereby declared as follows:—
- (i) All type designations for *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, made prior to the date of this *Opinion* are set aside :
 - (ii) *Echeneis naucrates* (emendation of *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758, is designated as the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758.
 - (iii) The name *Remora* as used by A. Gouan, 1770, by J. R. Forster, 1771, and by any other author prior to the publication of the name *Remora* Gill, 1862, is suppressed.
 - (iv) The name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (type species, by original designation : *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758) is validated.
- (b) The entry in *Opinion* 92 relating to the name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, is accordingly confirmed and the name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali), with the type species specified above, is hereby added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE

2. The mistake in *Opinion* 92 regarding the type species of *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, was discovered at the same time that the Commission's *Opinion* 16 was being examined in connection with a re-issue which was then in preparation. In consequence, the documents relating to the present case were in the first instance registered under the Number Z.N.(G.) 24, the File concerned with the arrangements for the re-issue of the older *Opinions* which were out of print and had become unobtainable. When however in 1944 it became evident that a special application would need to be submitted to the International Commission in regard to the present case, the documents relating to it were re-registered under the Number Z.N.(S.) 156. On the receipt of Mr. Hemming's application, it was considered that the most convenient course

would be to include it as one of the Notes which it had been decided to annex to *Opinion* 16 when re-issued. The revised edition of that *Opinion* was sent to the printer on 11th September 1945, but, owing to difficulties arising from paper rationing, shortage of labour at the printing works and similar causes, publication did not actually take place until 28th February 1947 (*Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 255—304).

3. *Issue of Public Notices* : On 20th November 1947 a notice of the possible use, by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, of its Plenary Powers in the present case was issued to the serial publications prescribed by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology, Monaco, 1913. The publication of this notice elicited no objection to the action proposed.

III.—THE DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

4. The present application was considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Fourteenth Meeting of its Paris Session held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July 1948 at 2030 hours. The following is an extract from the Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission, giving a summary of the discussion which took place on this case (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 538) :—

IT WAS GENERALLY AGREED that in view of the confusion which would result from the strict application of the *Règles* in the present case, the desirability of avoiding (wherever possible) the making of changes in entries previously made in the *Official List*, the wide and representative support for the present proposals received from leading ichthyologists and the complete lack of opposition of any kind, a case for the use of the Plenary Powers in the present instance had been established and that the application should be granted.

5. At the close of the discussion summarised in the preceding paragraph, the Commission took its decision in the present case. That decision is set out as follows in the Official Record of the

Proceedings of the International Commission (Paris Session, 14th Meeting, Conclusion 38) (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 536—539) :—

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to use their Plenary Powers to set aside the original indication of *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pisces, Order Discocephali) by absolute tautonymy (Article 30, Rule (d), as interpreted by *Opinion* 16) and in the place of that species to designate *Echeneis neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus ;
- (2) that neither Gouan (1770) nor Forster (1771) when using the word “*Remora*”, had used it as a generic name and therefore that the reputed generic names *Remora* Gouan, 1770, and *Remora* Forster, 1771, were to be rejected as having no existence under the *Règles* ;
- (3) to confirm explicitly the decision given implicitly in *Opinion* 92 (when the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, had been placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*) that a *faute d'orthographe* was evident in the spelling of the trivial name *neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis neucrates*) and therefore that the spelling of that trivial name is, under Article 19, to be emended to *naucrates* ;
- (4) to confirm the position on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the generic name *Echeneis* Linnaeus 1758 (type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) above : *Echeneis naucrates* (emend. *neucrates*) Linnaeus, 1758) (decision confirming action taken in *Opinion* 92) ;
- (5) to place the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862 (type species, by absolute tautonymy : *Echeneis remora* Linnaeus, 1758) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(6) to place the under-mentioned reputed but non-existent generic names, rejected under (2) above, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(i) *Remora* Gouan, 1770 ;

(ii) *Remora* Forster, 1771 ;

(7) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

naucrates Linnaeus, 1758 (emendation, under (3) above, of *neucrates*, as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis naucrates*)

remora Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Echeneis remora*) ;

(8) to render an *Opinion* recording the decisions specified in (1) to (7) above.

6. The decision in the present case was reported to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, at its Sixth Meeting held on 26th July 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 5 : 117).

7. The Ruling given in the present *Opinion* was concurred in by the sixteen (16) Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners present at the Paris Session of the International Commission, namely :—

Beltrán *vice* Cabrera ; Boschma ; Bradley ; di Caporiacco ; Hemming ; Hindle *vice* Jordan ; Jorge *vice* do Amaral ; Kirby *vice* Stoll ; Lemche *vice* Dymond ; Mansour *vice* Hankó ; Metcalf *vice* Peters ; Riley *vice* Calman ; Rode ; Spärck *vice* Mortensen ; van Straelen *vice* Richter ; Usinger *vice* Vokes.

8. The Ruling given in the present *Opinion* was dissented from by no Commissioner or Alternate Commissioner present at the Paris Session.

9. Under the regulations governing the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* and of the corresponding *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology*, the International Commission is required to place on these *Indexes* every generic name or, as the case may be, every specific name which it either rejects under its Plenary Powers or declares to be invalid. In the present instance, the required entries in the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* were duly specified in the Official Record of the Proceedings of the International Commission, but by some inadvertence no similar entry on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* was made in the Official Record of the specific name *neucrates* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Echeneis neucrates*, then (Point (3) of the Conclusion quoted in paragraph 5 of the present *Opinion*) rejected as an Invalid Original Spelling. This omission has been rectified in the Ruling given in the present *Opinion*.

10. The following are the original references for the names which appear in the decision set out in paragraph 5 above :—

Echeneis Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 260

naucrates (emend. of *neucrates*), *Echeneis* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 261

neucrates, *Echeneis*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 261

Remora Gouan, 1770, *Hist. Pisc.* : 10, [107], 183

Remora Forster, 1771, *Cat. Anim. N. Amer.* : 20

Remora Gill, 1863, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* 1862 : 239

remora, *Echeneis*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 260.

11. The gender of the generic name *Remora* Gill, 1862, referred to in the decision quoted in paragraph 5 above, is feminine.

12. At the time of the adoption of the Ruling given in the present *Opinion*, the expression prescribed for the second portion of the binomen which constitutes the scientific name of a species was the expression "trivial name" and the *Official List* reserved for recording such names was styled the *Official List of Specific*

Trivial Names in Zoology, the word "trivial" appearing also in the title of the *Official Index* reserved for recording rejected and invalid names of this category. Under a decision taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, the expression "specific name" was substituted for the expression "trivial name" and corresponding changes were made in the titles of the *Official List* and *Official Index* of such names (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 21). The changes in terminology so adopted have been incorporated in the Ruling given in the present *Opinion*.

13. The prescribed procedures were duly complied with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in dealing with the present case, and the present *Opinion* is accordingly hereby rendered in the name of the said International Commission by the under-signed Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in virtue of all and every the powers conferred upon him in that behalf.

14. The present *Opinion* shall be known as *Opinion* Two Hundred and Forty-Two (242) of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DONE in London this Thirteenth day of December, Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Three.

*Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature*

FRANCIS HEMMING

